April 16, 2004

Ms. Rebecca Brewer Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, P.C. P.O. Box 1210 McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2004-3085

Dear Ms. Brewer:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 199610.

The Frisco Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for police records involving a named individual. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We begin by noting that the information submitted as Exhibit B-4 includes an arrest warrant. The 78<sup>th</sup> Legislature recently amended article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to add language providing:

The arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, is public information, and beginning immediately when the warrant is executed the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the warrant and the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours. A person may request the clerk to provide copies of the warrant and affidavit on payment of the cost of providing the copies.

Crim Proc. Code art. 15.26. This provision makes the submitted arrest warrant expressly public. The exceptions found in the Public Information Act do not, as a general rule, apply to information that is made public by other statutes. See Open Records Decision No. 525

(1989) (statutory predecessor). Therefore, the department must release the arrest warrant included in Exhibit B-4 to the requestor.

We also note that Exhibit B-4 includes a complaint. Article 15.04 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that "[t]he affidavit made before the magistrate or district or county attorney is called a 'complaint' if it charges the commission of an offense." Case law indicates that a complaint can support the issuance of an arrest warrant. See Janecka v. State, 739 S.W.2d 813, 822-23 (Tex. Crim. App. 1987); Villegas v. State, 791 S.W.2d 226, 235 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi1990, pet. ref'd); Borsari v. State, 919 S.W.2d 913, 918 (Tex. App.—Houston [14 Dist.] 1996, pet. ref'd) (discussing well-established principle that complaint in support of arrest warrant need not contain same particularity required of indictment). The complaint at issue here indicates on its face that it was presented to the magistrate to support the issuance of this arrest warrant. We therefore determine that the complaint in Exhibit B-4, which we have marked, is made public by article 15.26 and must be released.

We next address your claimed exceptions with respect to the remainder of the submitted information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). When a law enforcement agency is asked to compile a particular individual's criminal history information, the compiled information takes on a character that implicates the individual's right to privacy in a manner that the same information in an uncompiled state does not. See United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749 (1989); see also Open Records Decision No. 616 at 2-3 (1993).

In the present request, the requestor asks for unspecified police records regarding a named individual. We determine that the request implicates the individual's right to privacy. Thus, to the extent the department maintains law enforcement records depicting the individual at issue as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendants, the department must withhold such information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy pursuant to the decision in *Reporters Committee*. We note, however, that the information in Exhibit B-1 does not make reference to the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, and does not relate to an alleged crime. This information is not part of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 and *Reporters Committee*. Thus, we determine the department must release Exhibit B-1 to the requestor.

In summary, we have marked an arrest warrant and supporting affidavit in Exhibit B-4 that the department must release to the requestor pursuant to article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. To the extent the department maintains law enforcement records depicting the individual at issue as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, other than the submitted arrest warrant and supporting affidavit, the department must withhold such information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remainder of the information at issue must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

David R. Saldivar

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 199610

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. James O. Skinner

Pezzulli Kinser, L.L.P.

17304 Preston Road, Suite 700

Dallas, Texas 75252 (w/o enclosures)